



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XII.—THE DIALECT OF THE *HILDEBRANDSLIED*.

As Holtzmann has shown the *Hildebrandslied* as we now have it is a copy from an older manuscript. That it was not written in its present form from memory is seen in the fact that the mistakes are those of sight. For example, *Hiltibraht* occurs six times for *Hiltibrant*, *man* for *inan*, *unti* for *miti*, etc. The errors show that the writer or writers did not fully understand what they were writing, and that their copying was mechanical. It follows that the manuscript from which they wrote did not differ materially from their copy, or in other words, that the linguistic confusion was already present. This confusion, however, cannot be entirely explained unless with Kögel we assume that at an earlier time there was a copy from memory.

Several theories have been advanced to explain this mixture of dialects. Müllenhoff (*MSD*, p. ix) was of the opinion that a copyist accustomed only to High German had attempted to write down a Low German poem. Holtzmann (*Germania*, ix, 289 f.) regarded the *Hild.* as a copy made by a L.G. from a H.G. manuscript, and this manuscript he thought was probably a Bavarian copy of a Franconian Carolingian original, *i. e.*, he saw here a mixture of three dialects. K. Meyer (*Germania*, xv, 17 f.) thinks that it is an O.S. copy of an O.H.G. original, and that this original was a pure Upper German work. That it was not written in Alemannic is shown by the entire lack of *ua* < *o* and the frequent use of *ao* < *au*. He concludes that it was written in Bavarian. Braune in the index of his *Ahd. Lesebuch* sets the *Hild.* down as "a mixed dialect: copy of an Upper German original by Saxon writers." Herm. Möller (*Zur ahd. Allitterationspoesie*, 54) declares that these theories are all wrong. According to him the *Hild.* is an E. Franc. Fuldic copy made in the second half of the ninth century from an Upper Franc. (E. or Rh. Franc.) original

belonging to the middle, or to the third quarter of the eighth century. That is, the differences we find here are not those of dialect, but simply of time.

According to Kögel (Paul's *Grundriss*, II, 174 f.) the following considerations show that the copyists could not have been Saxons. A Saxon would not have written double consonants in *hætti*, *heittu*, *mōtti*, *muotti*, *lētun*, *huūtte*, *harmliceo*. But a High German not accustomed to the Saxon orthography would naturally fall into this error in attempting to write Saxon, since the *zz* and *hh* in his own dialect would mislead him. The Saxon also would hardly write *ao* < *au*, for this writing never occurs in O.S.; nor would he be likely to write *æ*, *ae* in *ænon*, *hætti*, *furlaet*, *raet*, for this is seldom found in O.S. representing O.H.G. *ai*, *ei*, and never occurs in the preterit of reduplicating verbs.¹ Again, the form *sudsat* in line 53 points to the H.G. scribe who had his own *sudsaz* in mind.

To the above proofs we may add others. If the last copyist had been a Saxon, he would not have omitted or miswritten *h* before *r* and *w*; for *h* was well preserved in this position in O.S. long after it had disappeared in O.H.G. But our writer drops the *h* in *wer*, *welkhhes*, *werdar*, *ringd*; writes it correctly in *hrustim*, *hrusti*, *hregilo*, *huūtte*; but incorrectly in *gihueit*, *bihrahanen*, *hrāmen*. Scherer (*Zs. f. d. A.*, 26, p. 380) sees in *helidós*: *ringd*, of line 6, the old variation between the nom. and the acc. plural. This is a variation, however, that is never seen in O.H.G., and must here be O.S. Now, if the poem had originally been H.G., a Saxon would not have changed *helidā* to *helidós*, since nominatives plural in *-ā* also occurred.

As we have just seen, the copyist writes *tt* where the corresponding H.G. word has *zz*. But in *muotin* there is but one *t*, though *tt* should be written if it is the pret. opt. of *mōtian*. Now, as Kögel has told us, this word was foreign to O.H.G. It is quite possible that it was misunderstood by the H.G.

¹ It is equally true that it does not occur in the pret. of reduplicating verbs in O.H.G.

writer, who confused it with the pret. opt. of *muoen*, which is *muotin*. An O.H.G. form **muoztin* would never have been changed to *muotin* by one who knew how to write O.S. The single *t* of *bretôn* may also be explained by the fact that there was no corresponding H.G. word with *zz* to model the spelling after. If the H.G. scribe connected *sceotantero* with the H.G. verb, it seems to indicate that he would have written *sceozan*.

The writing of *ummet tirri* in line 25 is instructive. A Saxon that knew enough to change an O.H.G. form to O.S. would certainly not make *ummet tirri* out of *unmez irri*. Only when we start from an O.S. original, and suppose that a High German wrote the words as they sounded to him, do we find the explanation. Without doubt the Saxon spoke '*ummet*,' though he might have written '*unmet*;' and in pronouncing the two words together, the final *t* of *ummet* naturally joined itself to *irri*. The writer, therefore, wrote the words as we find them for the same reason that Otfrid wrote *binnih* for *bin ih*, *slihhtî* for *slihî*, etc.; cf. Braune, *Ahd. Gram.*, §§ 94, a. 1, 127, a. 1, 161, a. 5, 164, a. 3.

The alliteration in line 48 has been adduced in evidence that the poem could not have been originally Saxon. The verse reads:

dat du noh bi desemo rîche reccheo ni wurti.

As it stands *rîche* and *reccheo* alliterate, which would not be possible in O.S., since *reccheo* would begin with *w*. But in the corrupt state of the manuscript it is easily supposable that the line has been changed here, perhaps unintentionally, in the attempt to replace an alliteration that had been lost by one that the writer could appreciate. Originally the line might have read in some such way as Möller (*Ahd. All.*, 64) suggests:

ſat ſu wreccheo ni wurti bi ſesse wallantes rîche.

After bringing forward proof that the transcribers were not Saxons, it remains to show that the author of the *Hild*.

was a Saxon. Kögel gives a long list of words and phrases that do not occur in O.H.G. in the sense required here, or that are not found at all (see Paul's *Grundriss*, II, p. 176 f.). This evidence is borne out by the phonology. Let us then consider those sounds that have a different development in O.H.G. and in O.S., and see how much is on the O.S. level.

Ger. *an* (before þ) > *o* in *ódre*. Ger. *un* (before þ, s) > *u* in *gúðhamun*, *chúð* (twice), *gúdea*, *úsere*. The *n* in *chind* remains, as it does in O.S. *kind*.

Ger. *é* > *a* always, as in *wári*, *suásat*.

The vowel of the pret. in class I of the reduplicating verbs is *æ* in *hætti*. This has its counterpart in no other O.S. or O.H.G. monument. It does occur, however, in the pret. of ablauting verbs of the first class, as *aræ̃s*. Now it must be remembered that the H.G. scribe, wholly ignorant of O.S. orthography, represented O.S. sounds in his own manner. The vowel that he heard in *hætti* was doubtless open, and he therefore wrote it *æ*. The *ę* of *lęttun* and the *ae* of *furlaet* may be explained in the same way. Or we may compare the *ae* of *furlaet* with the *ei* of Isidor's *firleiz* (cf. *Ger. Studies*, U. of C., II, p. 39, and Brugmann, *Idg. Forsch.*, VI, 97).

Ger. *o* remains *o*, (1) in monosyllables; (2) in unstressed syllables, as *wallóta*; (3) in *frótóro*, *fróte*, *chónnem*, *góten*, *mótti*, *stónt*, *stópun*; (4) it becomes *uo* in *muotin*, *gistuont*, *gistuontun*, *cnuosles*, *fuortós*, *muotti*. The *uo* is probably due to the H.G. influence, though it is also found in O.S.

Ger. *ai* in the stem-syllable is represented by *ē* in *hēróro*, *ēr̃hina*, *gēru*, *ēw̃n*, *hēr̃ron wēwurt*, *hēremo*, *dēm* (where it would also be *ē* in O.H.G.); and in *urhēttun*, *tuēm*, *uwēt* (*wēttu*?¹), *hēme*, *ēñc*, *bēdero*. It is written *ē* in *ēnan*, *ēñgeru*, *sēolidante*, *wentilsēo*; *æ* in *ænon*, *ærist*; *ae* in *raet*; *ei* in *heittu*, *giweitt*, *gileitós*, *cheisuringu*, *gimeinun*.

¹ This belongs here if it is connected with O.H.G. *weizzen*. But it may be referred to Goth. *wadjón*, *wadjan*, as Möller, *Ahd. All.*, 95 f., suggests. The same derivation is given by Wilhelm Luft in a recent dissertation on *Die Entwicklung des Dialoges im alten Hild.*, p. 28, and credited to a 'Studienfreund.'

Of these writings ȝ only does not occur in O.S.; but all may well have been used to represent the open sound which the vowel must at that time have had. The *ai* of *staimbort* is the only decidedly un-Saxon writing, and is probably due to the H.G. scribe.

Ger. *aiw* > *eo* in *eo* (thrice) and *neo*.

Ger. *au* > δ in *gihórta*, *fóhēm*, *flóh*, *óstar* (thrice), *Ótachre(s)*, *tót*. Here the development is the same in O.H.G. as in O.S. It is *ao* in *laosa*, *-laos*, *aodlīhho*, and in *taoc*. This *ao*, in *taoc* as well as in the other words, was simply the H.G. scribe's method of representing the open δ of O.S., a method which he used in his own dialect to represent the first stage of the contracted *au*. The diphthong occurs once as *ou* in *bouga*, a writing that is also in O.S. The *au* of *rauba* is the only instance in which this diphthong is not easily explained from the O.S. view-point. The *au* of *hauwun* shows the regular O.S. development.

Ger. *eu* > *eo* regularly in *-deot*, *Theotrihhe*, *Deotrichhe*, *sceot-antero*, *leop*. In the same position it is ē in *Dētrihhe*,¹ *brēton*. It is regularly *iū* in *liuti*, *liuto*, *niuse*. The diphthong *iū* occurs by secondary formation in *hiutu*, *friunt*. The *eu* in *heuwn* corresponds to the first sing. pret. *heu* of O.S.

Consonants.—As already mentioned, *n* falls out before a surd spirant, except in *chind*.

Ger. *p* remains in *werpan*, *scarpēn*, *stōpun*, and is assimilated in *wambnum*.

Ger. *b* is represented by *b* initially, medially, and finally in *ibu* (thrice), *bāre*, *barn*, *arbeo*, *darbā*, *līb*, *obana*, *ab*, *bouga*, *bi* (thrice), *gibu*, *geba*, *bist*, *ubar*, *habēs* (twice), *burc*, *banun*, *bretōn*, *billiu*, *banin*, *rauba*, *brunnōno*, *bēdero*, *-bort*, and in the repetitions of *-brant* in the proper names; it is *v* in *hevane*; and its gemination is *bb* in *habbe*. It is twice *p* initially, *prūt*, *pist*; twice finally, *leop*, *gap*; and once geminated, *sippan*.

Ger. *f* is always *f*, occurring only initially.

¹The word must be written with ē < *eo*, as in *Dētrihhe*, if it is connected with O.E. *brēotan*.

Ger. *k* becomes: (a) medially between vowels, and finally after vowels, (1) *k* in *ik* (twice) and *harmlicco*; (2) *h(h)* in *ih* (five times), *mih* (thrice), *dih*, *sih* (thrice), *Theotrihhe*, *Detrihhe*, *aodlihho*, *welihhes*; (3) *ch* in *Deotricche*, *riche*. It becomes: (b) initially and in similarly treated positions (1) *k* in *cnuosles*, *folc* [*quad*] (thrice); (2) it becomes *ch* in *folche(s)*, *Ôtachre(s)*, *chind* (twice), *chuninc-*, *chuning*, *chûd* (twice), *de[n]chisto*, *chônnêm*, *cheisuringu*, *reccheo* (*chludun*?).

Here there is apparently considerable departure from O.S., but it is more in appearance than in reality. The treatment of Ger. *k* in (b) corresponds almost exactly to Isidor's orthography, where the *ch* does not stand for the affricate. Even in O.S. *ch* is sometimes used for *k*. The *ch* in (a) is probably not the same, but is rather the spirant. The pronouns and the proper names naturally took on their O.H.G. form.

Ger. *g* remains throughout initially and medially. Finally it is *g* in *chuning*, and *c* in *dinc*, *chuninc-*, *wic*, *sehtic*, *bure*, *taoc*, *ênic*.

Ger. *h*. We have already seen that the last copyists confused initial *h* before *r* and *w*. That *h* in this position was sounded in the original is seen by alliteration in *hringá* (6), *hrusti* (56), *hregilo*, *hwerdar* (61), *huittę* (66). The *h* is dropped with resulting contraction in *gimálta* (36), but preserved in *gimahalta* (7, 14, 45). It has been lost from *fireo*, in which it probably stood in the original; and has regularly disappeared in *niuse*, O.S. *niusian*, O.H.G. *niusen*, Goth. *niuhsjan*. In all other words it has remained.

Ger. *t* remains in all positions, as *tuēm*, *heittu*, *furlaet*. Ger. *ð* > *t* throughout.

Ger. *þ* is represented by *th* in *Theotrihhe*, and by *ð* in *ðat* (twice), *Haðubrant*, *gúðhamun*. In all other cases, of which there are seventy-seven, we find *d* initially, medially and finally. In the dentals, therefore, the development of Ger. *ð* only is un-Saxon.

In judging of the age of the *Hild.*, the most we can do is to fix the time when the 'vorlage' of the existing manuscript

was written. The use of *ai* in *staimbort*, of *au* in *rauba*, of *ao* (= *ā*) to represent the open *ō* < *au*, and of *eo* and never *io* points to about the middle of the eighth century. It was rather after than before 750; for *uo* and *ei* are used each five times. The use of *ei*, however, does not prove a later date than 750, for at this time the O.S. representative of Ger. *ai* had already reached its contracted stage. The very fact that so many characters are used to represent this sound—*e*, *ē*, *æ*, *ae*, *ei*, *ai*—shows that the writer was in doubt how it should be done. The *ou* of *bougā* and the *ch* for *hh* in *riche*, *Deot-ricche* are probably chargeable to the last copyist. Other evidence for the eighth century is the survival of the dat. plur. ending in *-m* in most of the forms.

The age of the existing manuscript is not so easily determined. For, as we have seen, the copying was done mechanically, with no intention of making changes. Where changes were made, they were probably due to defects in the 'vorlage,' or to carelessness or ignorance on the part of the transcribers. We may, however, set the date of the writing in the first part of the ninth century, with the assurance that, though it may have been later, a later date cannot be proved.

It now remains to determine the dialect of the H.G. element of the *Hild*. Claims have been set up for the Bavarian and for the Franconian. For the latter, it seems to me, the evidence is the better. The vowel-system is in the main as we should expect it from a Franconian in the third quarter of the eighth century who is writing O.S. The use of *ao* is more frequent than we should expect, and might seem to point to the Bavarian dialect. But this is not Bavarian, as *taoc* shows, but, as stated above, the writer's method of indicating open *ō*. Perhaps instead of *bougā* we should read *baogā*—the manuscript is here indistinct—and thus add another example of this representation of open *ō*. The form *leop* is Franc. as distinguished from Bav. *liup*, though this may be explained as a retention of the O.S. diphthong.

The consonants, where they have not remained on the O.S. level, are treated as in Franc., especially Rhine-Franc. This accounts for the use of *p* and of *ch* as given above. The constant *her* speaks also for the Franc. The *hē* as given in line 22 of Braune's text is a doubtful exception, since the manuscript reads *hera&*. We cannot be sure, therefore, that this is the O.S. *hē* retained. Further evidence for the Franc. need not be given, as a comparison of its phonology with that of the *Hild.* given above speaks for itself. It will be seen that there is nothing necessarily Bav.

Our conclusion in the whole matter then is this: (1) the *Hild.* was originally composed in O.S.; (2) this poem a Franconian in the third quarter of the eighth century wrote from memory or from dictation, representing the O.S. sounds according to his H.G. orthography; (3) this manuscript was afterward mechanically copied, probably in the early part of the ninth century, by a writer or by writers belonging also to the Franc. dialect.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.